



Vol. 8 (2014), pp. 326-344
<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/ldc>
<http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24611>

Training in the Community-Collaborative Context: A Case Study

Racquel-María Yamada
University of Oklahoma

Emerging community-based methodologies call for collaboration with speech community members. Although motivated, community members may lack the tools or training to contribute actively. In response, many linguists deliver training workshops in documentation or preservation, while others train community members to record data. Although workshops address immediate needs, they are limited to what the individual linguist can teach. Speech community linguists may articulate goals beyond what one researcher can undertake. This creates a need for more advanced training than can be provided in the field.

This paper uses a case study example to illustrate how the need for advanced training can be met through university-based workshops. It describes the process, challenges, and outcomes of bringing a nine-member team of Kari'ña (Cariban) speakers from Konomerume, Suriname to Eugene, Oregon for the 2010 Northwest Indian Language Institute's (NILI) annual Summer Institute and the Institute on Field Linguistics and Language Documentation (InField). Lessons learned are situated in the context of community-collaborative methodologies, and a central role for training is articulated. This paper demonstrates that collaboration need not be limited to academic and speech communities, but rather can extend to a greater population of individuals who share an interest in promoting linguistic diversity.

1. INTRODUCTION.¹ He and I had already been working together for a few years when the then-chief of Konomerume² (Suriname), Ferdinand Mandé, recounted a discussion he had had with another researcher. By that time, the researcher had visited the community a couple of times to record data. During their discussion, Chief Mandé said, “You know, you

¹ The support of the NSF (Grant No. BCS-208450) is gratefully acknowledged. I am forever indebted to the Konomerume linguists and teachers with whom I continue to have the privilege of working. My community collaboration includes too many people to list here, but Ferdinand Mandé, Sieglie Jubithana, Dennis Jubithana, and Henriette Alkantara deserve special mention. The documentation team includes Ignatius Mandé, Vivian Arupa, Emma Joghie, Yvonne Malbons, and elder speakers Cecilia Arupa and Maria Magdalena Alkantara. Johannes Legiman was instrumental in navigating the visa process on participants' behalf. NILI instructors and staff members provided indispensable support, as did Spike Gildea and Sérgio Meira. One of our greatest challenges was overcome by an amazing team of translators who volunteered their time and language skills. The Konomerume team and I are deeply grateful for their involvement and to Jeffrey Yamada for organizing this talented cadre. This paper draws, in part, from a previous poster presentation, Yamada & Jubithana (2013). Would that I could write without errors but alas, mistakes, omissions, and misinterpretations are inevitable. These are my responsibility alone.

² Konomerume is referred to as *Donderskamp* on government records. C.f. Yamada (in press) for a description of the name's etymology.

keep coming to study me. When do I get to go to (your country) to study you?” Although his comment was directed toward another researcher, and he was recounting the story to me in the context of complimenting my own approach to community collaboration, I took his point to heart. This ‘light bulb moment’ planted a seed that ultimately grew into the project described here.

Since 2004, I have been working with Konomerume community members to document, describe, and revitalize the non-prestige *Aretyry* dialect of *Kari’nja* (Cariban).³ Although I work with several teams of community members, I have worked most closely and most extensively with Chief Mandé. Once nicknamed ‘the Writing Chief,’ he has been working to document his native language since he became Chief in the early 90s. His interest in and work on *Kari’nja* predates his association with me. Prior to our collaboration, he had been writing down as much of the language as he could remember, and consulting with elders to clear up questions he had. He kept his documentary corpus in notebooks in his home. Early in our work together, he asked me to teach him other means of documenting the language and preserving recorded data. From the outset, our collaboration has involved other community members. For example, we have worked in consultation with elder native speakers on documentation, Chief Mandé has identified and I have trained a technology team, and I have worked with teachers to develop both elementary school and adult class curricula.

Together with other community members, Chief Mandé and I work cooperatively to develop and implement projects that are of balanced mutual benefit. For each new project we have undertaken, I have developed training workshops based on community members’ stated needs. Although they have had limited access to formal schooling, the community members with whom I work are motivated to learn both techniques for documentation and principles of linguistic analysis. Our approach forms the basis of the Community Partnerships Model (CPM) of linguistic field research with endangered languages, as articulated in Yamada (2010). A primary tenet of the model, which grew directly from our work together, is that training be provided for community members in documentation, linguistic analysis, and teaching methods (to the extent that they are interested).

In 2008, the Konomerume *Kari’nja* documentation team requested more advanced training than I could provide in the field. Together, we drafted a grant proposal, and with NSF support,⁴ a nine-member team traveled from Suriname to Oregon to participate in the 2010 Institute on Field Linguistics and Language Documentation (InField), and the Northwest Indian Language Institute’s (NILI) annual Summer Institute (henceforth, NILI/InField)⁵. This paper has three primary objectives. First of all, I describe the process, challenges, and outcomes—both tangible and intangible—of the journey from Konomerume to Oregon. Secondly, I explore why training for speech community members is appropriate in a collaborative context in that it supports active engagement with and by communities. Finally, this paper contributes to the larger discussion of community-collaborative linguistic

³ The dialect is commonly referred to as *Murato* in the literature, a name speakers consider pejorative. The language is also known as Carib of Suriname, or simply Carib. *Kari’nja Auran* refers to the language, which speakers shorten to simply *Kari’nja* (which also refers to the people). I use speakers’ autodesignation throughout.

⁴ Grant No. BCS-208450

⁵ <http://linguistics.uoregon.edu/infield2010/home/>

field research by articulating a central role for training of community members. Implications for research methods draw from the challenges and successes of the Konomerume project as a case study.

2. BACKGROUND & DEMOGRAPHICS. Located on the banks of the Wajambo River in Suriname, Konomerume is home to approximately 349 full-time residents (Suriname General Bureau of Statistics Census Office, 2004). A K-6 community elementary school is administered by the Roman Catholic Special Education Unit (RKBO), and staffed by local teachers.⁶ There is also a clinic in the community staffed by a nurse practitioner and administered by the Medical Mission, Suriname (MZ). Most residents self-identify as ethnically Kari'nja or Lokono, with a small percentage identifying as Warao. Since census data conflate ethnicity and language, it is difficult to ascertain exactly how many fluent Kari'nja speakers reside in the community, but all adults have at least some passive knowledge of the language. Only a handful speaks Lokono. Both Kari'nja (Cariban) and Lokono (Arawakan) are highly endangered, and Warao (isolate) is no longer spoken in Suriname.

Kari'nja in Konomerume is at Fishman's (1991) Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) Stage 7. Fluent native speakers aged 65 and above use the language as the primary language of communication amongst themselves. Members of the 'middle' generation, comprised of native speakers who are approximately 45 to 65 years old, use Kari'nja with their elder parents, but speak primarily Sranan Tongo or Dutch with each other and with their children and grandchildren. Young adults, aged 20 to 40, are native 'understanders,' but rarely speak the language. Children are not currently acquiring the language natively, but do receive some instruction in the language at school. There are also evening classes aimed primarily at young adult parents of school-aged children.

From the outset of our work together, Konomerume elders were adamant that our documentation include a cultural component, and community leaders advocated for training. We record culturally embedded language by documenting important cultural practices and the language that accompanies them. A local technology team, who I began training early in our work together, does most of the recording. To date, we have expanded the available documentary corpus of Kari'nja to include audio and video recordings in several speech genres, produced a working trilingual dictionary, analyzed several linguistic phenomena (c.f. Yamada, 2010, 2011a, 2011b, in press), and developed curricula for both the elementary school and adult language classes.

3. TERMINOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY. There are several terms in linguistic field research that are not well defined across researchers. *Community* can be particularly problematic. Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) and Rice (2011) provide an overview of the ways in which this term is applied. I use the term to refer to a group of people who may share a

⁶ Chief Mandé's forward vision is exemplified by local staffing of the school. Prior to the 1986 civil war, teachers from the capital city, Paramaribo, had staffed the community school. Attrition was common, and the school was chronically understaffed. When the school closed because of the war, Chief Mandé realized something needed to change if the school was to continue to function. He solicited a commitment from the RKBO to train community members as teachers. He then recruited potential teachers locally who were trained in Paramaribo. Since all have family ties in Konomerume, teacher attrition is no longer the burden it once was.

physical location, a history, and/or a culture. While I make a distinction between *speech community* and *academic community*, I acknowledge an artificial binary distinction between the two. By *speech community* in this specific context, I refer to members of the Konomerume, Suriname community who have participated in or supported the work described in this article. In a more general way, I employ the term in reference to other, similar, communities.

I refer to an *academic community* that includes both university- and non-university-affiliated researchers who are not members of the speech communities with which they conduct research. In both cases (speech and academic), I in no way assert that a community is homogeneous in terms of membership, needs, or goals. My central thesis is that training for speech community members can blur the lines between communities as speech community members take on roles and responsibilities that have traditionally been the sole purview of outsider academics. Furthermore, as more and more members of so-called speech communities earn advanced degrees and begin work on their own heritage languages, the line between ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ becomes more of a continuum.

Leonard and Haynes (2010) point out the problematic nature of *collaboration* in that it reinforces a binary distinction between communities. Furthermore, Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) and Linn (2011) question the nature of a collaboration wherein an outsider researcher’s agenda takes precedence over speech community members’ goals for their languages. I adopt a view similar to that proposed by Leonard and Haynes (2010) wherein all major stakeholders in a collaborative endeavor share responsibility for planning and implementation. By providing advanced training to speech community members who have requested it, a more balanced collaboration becomes possible. This approach assumes that there are motivated members of the speech community interested in advancing their own training agenda.

With the emergence of language documentation as a unique sub-specialty in linguistics have come calls for increased awareness of speech community needs. Community-based research (Rice, 2011) has become more common as linguistic field researchers seek to involve speech community members. Although there is no ‘one size fits all’ approach,⁷ emerging collaborative models call for a shift beyond advocacy research done *for* community members (Cameron, et al., 1992), and toward an empowerment model that supports work done *with* and *by* community members.⁸

The Community Partnerships Model (CPM) of linguistic field research (Yamada, 2010) complements previous and emerging collaborative models (c.f. Rice, 2011; Leonard & Haynes, 2010; Florey, 2004; Grinevald, 2003; Czaykowska-Higgins, 2009; Furbee &

⁷ In fact, community collaboration is neither expected nor welcomed in many cases (c.f. Crippen & Robinson, 2013; Dobrin, 2008; Holton, 2009). My focus is on collaboration with community members who have articulated a desire to work on their languages. I work with community members who are willing and able to work in cooperation with an outsider researcher. This may not be the case in all field research situations.

⁸ In some cases, this has translated into the notion of ‘giving back’ to the speech community (c.f. Rice, 2011 for discussion). ‘Mobilization’ of language documentation is framed, in part, as “fieldwork delivered *to* a language community (Nathan, 2006:364).” This is done “...in order to encourage and support language strengthening (Nathan, 2006:365).” Although it seeks to meet community needs, fieldwork of this type builds on the notion of advocacy research done *for* (Nathan, 2006; Cameron et al., 1992; 1997) rather than *with* or *by* speech community members.

Stanley, 2002; Stebbins, 2003; Vallejos, 2014; Guérin & Lacrampe, 2010; Yamada, 2007, 2011a) and is an outgrowth of my work with Kari'nja speakers in Suriname. Major tenets of the model include collaboration with speech community members, long-term commitment, and ongoing training. The CPM seeks more balanced control of the research agenda and products of documentation. Collaboration is seen as reciprocal as goals are mutually determined and mutually beneficial. An effective collaboration depends on communication among all stakeholders, as well as a shared understanding of individual goals and roles in a documentation project. This may include developing a way of talking about language that is accessible and transparent to both community and outsider linguists. At the outset of a collaborative partnership, speech community members may lack the necessary schooling, training, or experience to conduct their own documentation. In order to fill this gap, the CPM takes a principled approach to training based on speech community members' stated needs. Rather than the outsider linguist delivering a workshop as a pre-packaged whole, the CPM advocates collaborating with community members to identify and articulate an appropriate response to perceived gaps in knowledge.

This approach has several advantages. First of all, developing a shared language facilitates higher levels of collaboration. Secondly, with a more balanced control of the research agenda and shared ownership of products comes a deeper and more comprehensive documentation. Finally, community members are empowered to articulate their own needs and realize their own goals, both in cooperation with the outsider researcher and independently.

One primary drawback of many collaborative models is the reliance on the outsider academic linguist for resources. The linguist must have not only a strong familiarity with the process of, and tools for, documentation, s/he must also be able to share that knowledge in an accessible way. Additionally, training is limited to what the linguist can teach. This limitation is what led to the project described here. Chief Mandé's statement about traveling to study another researcher, combined with community members' stated need for more advanced training than I could provide alone, led me to investigate other training opportunities.

University-based institutes such as NILI, the American Indian Language Development Institute (AILDI), the Canadian Indigenous Language and Literacy Development Institute (CILLDI), and the Oklahoma Breath of Life (OKBOL) (c.f. Fitzgerald & Linn, 2013) have the advantage of bringing together experts in various fields to provide a wide array of training opportunities. In addition to providing a wider range of expertise, they reach a wider community. These institutes are so successful in part because of the multiple perspectives--both of instructors and participants--they bring together. However, their activities have been limited to communities in North America, usually within the region of the particular institute (though that is changing--in recent years, NILI has attracted participants from Alaska, Hawai'i, Mississippi, and New Mexico). Some organizations such as NILI or the Resource Network for Linguistic Diversity (RNLD) in Australia provide onsite training, but these, too, are limited to the regions in which the particular organization operates. Communities in South America have had very limited access to training programs such as these, and those that do seek to meet their needs are limited to small, linguist-delivered, single-iteration regional training programs.⁹

⁹ However, c.f. Vallejos (2014) for a notable exception.

In 2010, a unique opportunity presented itself. NILI would be partnering with InField (renamed CoLang in 2012) to provide workshops in language documentation for an international audience in addition to NILI's usual course offerings in linguistics, language preservation, and teaching. Although other training institutes exist, InField attracts participants representing the broadest range of countries and language families. In addition, InField includes topics related to documentation and advocacy, unlike regional symposia such as *Amazônicas*. InField is also more practically oriented than conferences such as the International Conference on Language Documentation and Conservation (ICLDC) in Hawai'i. After reviewing other possible venues, we decided NILI/InField would best meet our particular training needs.

4. THE PROJECT. In our work together prior to the project described here, I had trained teams of community members in introductory Kari'nja linguistics, methods, and technology for language documentation, and materials and methodologies for second language teaching. I drew from my understanding of community member's expressed needs, published descriptions of Kari'nja (primarily Hoff, 1968), my own schooling in linguistics and second language teaching, and my background as a teacher trainer both with NILI and elsewhere. By 2008, community members identified more advanced topics than I could address alone. Together, we drafted a three-phase project to bring a nine-member team to the University of Oregon (UO) to participate in the 2010 NILI/InField Summer Institute and Workshop Series.

Our original plan had been to take a three-member team to Oregon: Chief Mandé as its leader, along with a two-member technology team comprised of Sieglien and Dennis Jubithana. However, as we looked at the course offerings and spoke with other community members, we realized we could make better use of resources with a larger team. The resulting 9-member team was comprised of three groups: a technology team, a team of elementary school teachers (members of both of these groups are also Kari'nja 'understanders' and learners), and a team of elder native speakers.

We decided that all nine participants would attend the two-week series of workshops. Six members would then take advantage of the following 'lab week,' during which they made use of advanced technology in the UO phonetics lab to record elder speakers in a more controlled environment. Finally, three members of the team enrolled in the InField Field Methods course, which continued for an additional three weeks beyond the Workshop Series and lab week.

Individual members of each group attended different NILI/InField workshops. In addition, several members participated in a special daily class on Kari'nja and Cariban linguistics taught by Spike Gildea, Sérgio Meira, and myself. Team members also participated in the Models of Language Documentation plenary series where they shared their own work with other workshop participants. Chief Mandé co-taught a workshop on fieldwork ethics and collaboration. In addition to NILI/InField training, while in Oregon, elder speakers were recorded in a controlled environment in the UO phonetics lab. Producing the recordings provided 'on the job training' for the documentation team, and resulting recordings add to the available corpus in the language.

During the Field Methods course, Chief Mandé, together with Dennis and Sieglien Jubithana, worked with a native speaker to describe Wapishana, an Arawakan language

unrelated to Kari'nja. The rest of the team and I returned to Konomerume during this time, where we began implementing the tools and training they learned while in Oregon by recording elder speakers and developing new pedagogical materials. During this second phase of the project we began training additional teachers in Konomerume in computer skills, language teaching methods, and materials development. We also made a plan for facilitating training for teachers and leaders from the neighboring communities of Cornelis Kondre and Kalebas Kreek.

During the third phase of the project, Chief Mandé, Dennis and Sieglien Jubithana, and I were to travel to Baramita, Guyana immediately after NILI/InField to record speakers of what was purportedly the same dialect of Kari'nja. We hoped to forge a community-to-community partnership among Kari'nja speakers. Additionally, the data recorded in Guyana would expand the available corpus of Kari'nja recordings and shed light on previously undescribed dialectal differences. In addition, recording in Guyana would allow the Konomerume team to review their newly learned skills with my direct advice and assistance. However, the unexpected death of Desrey Caesar Fox, a Guyanese Minister of Education who had spearheaded that phase of the project, put the Guyana trip on hold. She was a driving force for indigenous languages in Guyana and a personal friend and mentor to me. I was unsure as to whether I would have the wherewithal to complete the project in her absence.

However, after an extended delay, we completed this phase in June 2013. While in Guyana, we met with the Minister of Culture, Youth, and Sport who provided his whole-hearted support of the documentation project. In addition, we traveled to Baramita Guyana where we recorded Kari'nja speakers in three genres: storytelling, personal narrative, and narration of an elicitation video we had also used in Konomerume.¹⁰

In the sections that follow, I report on the first phase of this larger project that included workshops for additional communities in Suriname and documentation of the variety of Kari'nja spoken in Guyana. I outline the goals, challenges, and outcomes of the NILI/InField training component and situate it in the greater context of community-based field research methodologies.

4.1 GOALS. In attending NILI/InField, our primary goals included building capacity, sharing with others, and supporting continued documentation of Kari'nja. Each of these is described in turn.

4.1.1 BUILD CAPACITY. We set out to build on training I had provided over the years in Konomerume. Capacity-building for the team included developing both practical skills and intellectual understanding. The former included workshops in audio and video recording and editing, lexicography, database management programs (e.g. Miromaa), and curriculum development. As for the latter, deeper grasp of linguistic analysis was nurtured through a Kari'nja linguistics workshop attended by representatives from all three groups (elder native speakers, adult teacher/learners, and the technology team). This workshop afforded us the unique opportunity to address ongoing questions in the description of the language. Most sessions began with a question from one of the team members about a particular

¹⁰ An upcoming article will examine the Guyana trip in more detail.

element of morphosyntax. Since the team included elder native speakers, we could immediately elicit examples as the group worked through a problem cooperatively. Gildea and Meira could draw on their vast comparative knowledge to provide examples of cognates. Teachers could then puzzle through how they might present a particular construction to students with the advice and guidance of the rest of the group. This process contributed to expanding all participants' intellectual understanding of Kari'nja in an egalitarian and supportive way.

The three-member team who participated in field training with Wapishana gained both practical skills and increased understanding of a language that is vastly different from Kari'nja. One of our long-term goals is to begin documentation of the other language that is indigenous to Konomerume, Lokono. The team's experience with a related Arawakan language will be essential when we begin work on Lokono.

4.1.2 SHARE WITH OTHERS. An under-acknowledged, intangible benefit of workshops like NILI and InField is in the shared experience of both the highs and lows of work with endangered languages. Kari'nja community members were afforded the invaluable experience of interacting with speech community linguists from places as far from their own community as Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific Northwest. One participant noted that attending NILI/InField was like 'fueling the tank' in that sharing with others in similar situations helped motivate him in his own language work.

In addition to drawing from others' knowledge and experiences, the Kari'nja team shared their own work with participants from other countries. Chief Mandé co-led a workshop entitled "Blurring the Lines," aimed at examining relationships between outsider academic and speech community linguists. The whole team presented their ongoing work as a part of the "Models" series of plenary sessions.

Beyond the sharing they did in Oregon, the Kari'nja team has taken their newfound skills to other community members both in Konomerume and in neighboring villages. The team shared the documentation and teaching tools we have produced to date, and introduced community members to basic recording techniques, lesson planning, and teaching methods. They continue to foster relationships among the three Wajambo River communities, with the Konomerume team providing advice and assistance based on what they learned in Oregon and their own experience as documenters of Kari'nja.

4.1.2 CONTINUE DOCUMENTATION. While in Oregon, elder speakers were recorded in the soundproof booth at UO. The recordings serve several purposes. First of all, recording elder speakers served as 'on the job training' for the technology team to learn more advanced recording techniques with a goal of improving recordings made in the field. Secondly, team members, already trained to use the transcription program Transcriber, used the recordings to gain greater facility with the program. Finally, the recordings provide important data in support of the eventual analysis of the complex prosodic system in Kari'nja. This analysis is currently in progress.¹¹

¹¹ Susan Guion Anderson was supervising the analysis of these recordings at the time of her death in 2011. Her absence is deeply felt.

The team continues to document Kari'nja as spoken in the Wajambo region. Additionally, we made initial recordings of the variety spoken in Baramita, Guyana in 2013. Although both communities (Baramita and Konomerume) purportedly speak the same Aretyry dialect, our recordings make it clear that they are nearly mutually unintelligible. Chief Mandé, a native speaker, struggled to understand the Guyana variety.

In addition to Kari'nja, the team is dedicated to the documentation of Lokono as it is spoken in Konomerume. They recorded two native speakers immediately on our return from Oregon. These recordings form the only documentation of Konomerume Lokono conversation to date. The team will continue building an initial corpus of Lokono while we search for funding for a more comprehensive documentation project.

4.2 CHALLENGES. Challenges were of four primary types: practical, financial, interpersonal, and follow-up. In this section, I describe each of these in turn. The account of each issue is followed by a description of how it was (or might have been) overcome, as well as lessons learned.

4.2.1 PRACTICAL CHALLENGES. Practical challenges included securing passports and visas, accompanying community members to and from the US, and organizing translators for the multiple workshop sessions various team members would be attending.

Since I was in the United States and not in Suriname when community members began travel preparations, I was not available to facilitate securing passports and visas for the team. Although they could navigate getting passports on their own, securing a U.S. visa proved more daunting. The visa process in Suriname requires applicants to complete paperwork online, and then be present in Paramaribo for an in-person interview. Members of the technology team are adept at using cyber cafes to send and receive e-mail, but they could not navigate the U.S. Embassy website. Fortunately, Dr. Johannes Legiman, then the doctor for Peace Corps Suriname, was able to help. He knew about our language work and graciously volunteered to assist with securing visas. He helped individual team members to complete paperwork and set up interview appointments at the embassy.

The second major practical challenge was in accompanying the team to and from Suriname. Although they are capable adults, most team members had never flown internationally. Since they would be returning to Suriname in two separate groups (one after the three week workshop and lab week, and one after the additional three-week Field Methods course), they would require two chaperones who could speak Sranan Tongo, Dutch, or Kari'nja. Here, too, help had to be recruited. Fortunately, Jeffrey Yamada, a fluent Sranan Tongo and Dutch speaker, was available to accompany the whole team from Konomerume to Oregon. At the conclusion of the workshop, I accompanied the first group back to Konomerume, and he chaperoned the second group.

Another practical challenge was in translation. All NILI/InField workshops were to be conducted in English. Although Chief Mandé and Sieglien Jubithana are fluent speakers, the rest of the team had had limited exposure to the language. Again, Jeffrey Yamada came to our aid. He used social media and Returned Peace Corps Volunteer listservs to find Dutch and/or Sranan Tongo speakers. He then organized a schedule such that every course to be attended by a Kari'nja team member would have a translator present. He and I also

filled slots when he was not working or I was not teaching.

Each translator worked with workshop instructors to facilitate translation. Translators provided simultaneous translation for Kari'nja participants as an instructor was presenting. Additionally, translators would spend a few minutes after class addressing any questions Konomerume team members still had. This strategy was an effective way to ensure team members had grasped content and to clear up misunderstandings. Instructors were tremendously supportive, often staying after class or making themselves available at other times to address questions. Other institute participants were similarly supportive and seemed pleased to have translators present so the Konomerume team could more fully contribute to class discussions.

One drawback to translation was the delay between an utterance and its translation. In some cases, by the time something was translated, the instructor had moved on to a new topic before Konomerume team members could comment. Simply making instructors aware of the problem ameliorated this. Once they were made aware, most took the time to ask for input from the Konomerume team before moving on to a new topic. More than one instructor told me how much they appreciated having Kari'nja participants enrolled in their courses.

A common theme in overcoming practical challenges is asking for help. This project would have been impossible without volunteers. In this case, community collaboration extended beyond solely the speech and academic communities to the greater 'community' of people who might have an interest in encouraging linguistic diversity by supporting the Konomerume Kari'nja team's valuable work.

4.2.2 FINANCIAL CHALLENGES. The cost of airfare, workshop fees, food, and lodging for nine people to travel internationally is significant. This particular challenge was met with an NSF-Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) grant. My experience with funding agencies and drafting proposals was essential. Community members would not have had access to this particular source of funding without my input.¹² They lack affiliation with any U.S. institution and have limited experience with proposal drafting. Although we were fortunate enough to secure funding, this is a thorny issue for members of other marginalized communities who may want to access international training opportunities. Possible ways to mitigate financial challenges include creative use of existing funding sources, on-site training workshops, partnership with other organizations, and training in grant writing for speech community members.

The DEL initiative often funds projects that send an outsider researcher to a speech community to conduct documentation. Funding for community member travel to a workshop was a creative use of DEL funds. In this case, although broader impacts were clear, we had to ensure that the project had intellectual merit as defined by the NSF. The recordings made while at NILI/InField and the documentation of the variety of Kari'nja spoken in Guyana fulfilled this requirement.

Another way to reduce costs would be to provide on-site workshops where trainers travel to the community rather than community members traveling to an institute. This includes workshops that are held in some central location (such as a capitol city) that

¹² In fact, I have a proposal currently under review for a project that would facilitate access to funding for members of underrepresented groups.

would draw members of several communities. The drawback to this approach is that the number of trainers would be much more limited, and community members would not reap the benefits of interacting with an audience of international participants. However, training institutes that also offer on-site training (such as NILI and the RNLD) are able to meet a greater range of needs than any individual linguist can in the field.

Partnerships need not be limited to a single outsider researcher working in partnership with members of a single speech community. Members of the Konomerume community have approached the VIDS in the hope of developing a training institute that could be held in Paramaribo for members of other (non-Kari'nja) communities in Suriname. In addition, cross-disciplinary projects such as those that combine linguistics, cultural anthropology, and geography (c.f. Yamada, *in press*) allow researchers from various disciplines to work in cooperation. This model might be extended to include training workshops for members of indigenous communities.

Finally, training community members in grant writing may help them secure funding that might otherwise have been inaccessible to them. Unfortunately, none of the Konomerume team members was able to attend the grant-writing workshop at NILI/InField, but all agreed that it would be an important skill to learn.

4.2.3 INTERPERSONAL CHALLENGES. Although rarely addressed in the literature, the deeply personal nature of close collaboration with speech communities engenders unique interpersonal challenges. Furthermore, even small, purportedly homogenous communities are not without internal disagreement (c.f. Morrill, 2008). Two major setbacks tested group cohesion. When one original member of the team could not secure a passport, replacing her was problematic. Each team member had someone in mind, and no one could agree on whom to choose. This was compounded by the fact that there was no time to secure a passport, so whomever was chosen had to have a passport in hand. This left a small pool of potential candidates, and the team was divided. In the end, Chief Mandé made an unpopular judgment call that left some members of the team feeling alienated. The resulting discord might have been mediated with better communication. However, the fact that Chief Mandé was in Paramaribo and the rest of the team was in Konomerume made communication very difficult. Ultimately, a small group of elders implored the rest of the team to make the best of the situation and not let discord interfere with the trip.

The second interpersonal dispute happened when Jeffrey Yamada arrived in Konomerume to accompany the team back to the U.S. Some group members had had a disagreement, and one had decided she no longer wanted to make the journey. It was much too late to find a replacement, so it appeared that the team would travel without one member. The rest of the team had already arrived in Paramaribo to begin the journey when a community leader approached the team member who had stayed behind in Konomerume. He reminded the team member of the greater good that the trip would serve and suggested that strengthening the language and representing Konomerume were more important than interpersonal disputes. In the end, the team member was convinced, and ended up being one of the more dedicated workshop participants.

In both cases, community members stepped up and solved problems without my intervention. Had this been seen as only 'my' project, I doubt the greater community would have addressed these interpersonal challenges. Instead, community elders and leaders saw

the value in the project for them, personally, and were willing to support the project by intervening when interpersonal conflicts challenged project success. Here, again, the community-inclusive approach, and recognition that no single person was solely responsible for the project were exemplified. With community buy-in and ownership of projects, the outsider academic is not solely responsible for success. Community members can be relied on to solve problems and see projects through to completion.

4.2.4 FOLLOW-UP CHALLENGES. An unforeseen challenge involved follow-up. During NILI/InField, I successfully defended my Ph.D. dissertation, and graduated shortly after the conclusion of the project. I then spent three years on the job market (accepting visiting positions while seeking more permanent employment). During that time, I had limited contact with the team in Konomerume. When I finally returned to the community in June of 2013 to complete the third phase of the project (documentation in Guyana), it was clear that my absence and lack of regular contact had been interpreted negatively. From my perspective, the Konomerume team had received the tools and training they needed in order to work independently on their own documentation and revitalization projects, and they had indeed done so. However, I had neglected the most important aspect of community-collaborative field research: relationships.

My interpersonal relationships with community members do not end at the conclusion of a particular project. Although community members were indeed able, in terms of capacity, to function independently, there was a sense of abandonment that could have been prevented with more forethought and preparation on my part. This was, perhaps, the most difficult personal lesson learned, and the most likely to be neglected in the articulation of a field research methodology. It is easy to unintentionally set up false expectations in a cooperative framework. This situation might have been avoided had community members and I done one of two things. First of all, we could have had a more frank discussion of expectations. I could have explained that my upcoming job search was likely to take time, and we could have negotiated the frequency and type of communication the team felt they would need from me. Secondly, we could have remained in closer contact. Although I am easily reachable by telephone, the reality is that many community members are reluctant (or financially unable) to phone. Community members' success does not depend on me, but our continued positive interactions do demand that I invest time in nurturing our relationships. There is an expectation that relationships continue even after the conclusion of a project. The long-term commitment component of the CPM is essential to ongoing working relationships both in the individual community and in the region.¹³

If there is a common theme in meeting all of the challenges described here, it is that no single individual is responsible for the success or failure of a true collaborative project. All stakeholders share responsibility for seeing a project through, and challenges are best addressed cooperatively. Practical challenges of this project were met by asking for help

¹³ As noted by an anonymous reviewer, by this description, responsibility for continued contact appears to lie primarily with me, the outsider researcher. This seems to be at odds with a model that depends on effective communication among *all* stakeholders, and community members share responsibility for continued interaction. Although the point is well taken, it is nonetheless the case that I have better access to phone service than most community members do. This situation is changing, however, as cell phones become more common in Suriname.

outside of the immediate community. Financial challenges may be met through cooperation with other researchers or organizations. Interpersonal challenges were overcome by the intercession of other community members. Finally, follow-up challenges can be mitigated through effective communication. Ultimately, effective community-based collaboration depends on an investment by all stakeholders in nurturing and renewing relationships with each other.¹⁴ Although the primary objective of this project was to provide advanced training to community members who had requested it, a community-based methodology necessitates that some attention be paid to the greater context in which that training was provided.

4.3 OUTCOMES. Outcomes of the project included both tangible and intangible benefits. Through training a nine-member team, we tripled the number of potential collaborators on Kari'nja projects. The documentation team then added to this number by sharing what they learned in Oregon with other community members. They have, to date, trained one community member in the use of recording devices and editing software. This person now functions as an additional member of the technology team. They have also trained an additional elementary school teacher in language teaching methods and materials development. This person now leads the group of teachers who develop lessons for both the elementary school and adult classes.

Prior to this project, Chief Mandé led a documentation team that included Dennis and Sieglien Jubithana. They had received the most comprehensive training, participating in workshops created for various community groups. I had facilitated workshops in basic linguistics and curriculum development for the elementary school teachers, second language teaching methods for a core group of elder native speakers, and techniques and technology for documentation for a technology team. With this project, members of all groups came together to learn about a wider variety of concepts. In this way, we tripled the number of well-trained collaborators on Kari'nja projects.

This team then shared their knowledge with other Wajambo region Kari'nja by training additional Konomerume community members as well as teachers and leaders from two neighboring communities. In addition, a former Konomerume teacher who now works in Washabo (on the Suriname-Guyana border) received technology training. Knowledge acquired at NILI/InField was shared both in Konomerume and across neighboring communities. Both this project and prior projects have funded recording equipment including a laptop computer, camcorder, and associated peripherals (microphones, software, etc.) that continues to be used in Konomerume. Since we began working together in 2005, it has been my practice to leave all equipment purchased for use in Konomerume with trained team members for their later use (c.f. Yamada, 2007, 2009).¹⁵ Community members built a storage locker that is housed in the community women's center to store equipment. The team charges laptop and camcorder batteries during the three to four hours per night that the community generator runs. The Kari'nja language team is currently drafting a proposal

¹⁴ This is certainly not unique to academic/speech community collaborations. Most collaborative undertakings rely on trust and communication between stakeholders.

¹⁵ This practice is uncommon, but becoming more acceptable as speech community members take on more responsibility for documentation both independently and as subcontractors to other academic linguists (c.f. Mihás, 2012).

to fund materials to construct a stand-alone building for language-related activities. They have used this equipment both to continue their own documentation and to train other community members in basic computer skills.

This project empowered community members to take on projects of their own design and work toward independent revitalization goals. Inspired by the example of the Maori teachers they met at InField, the Konomerume team has initiated two language nest-type projects. For one, elder native speakers are asked to care for pre-school-aged children during school hours. This project has had varied levels of success. A common challenge for this and similar programs is that elders often lack the energy to chase preschoolers. Konomerume community leaders are currently exploring ways in which this and other challenges can be met. An after school program has been more successful. A common practice in Suriname is known as *koiri*, which involves visiting and chatting with neighbors and extended family members. In Konomerume, people sit together in open-air structures to discuss the day's goings-on. One of the elementary school teachers has been taking her students on a *koiri* to her grandmother's house after school. While there, only Kari'nja is spoken. Occasionally, other elders also attend these informal get-togethers wherein children are immersed in the language. The advantage, here, is that the teacher is available to handle disciplinary issues so the elders can focus on creating a Kari'nja-rich environment for the children.

During the final phase of this project, Chief Mandé, Dennis and Sieglien Jubithana, and I traveled to Guyana to document the variety of Kari'nja spoken there. This core team tested their skill in documentation and analysis, as well as participated in a field research project that involved community entry and relationship-building. This was a challenging trip that taught us about more than just dialectal diversity. Lessons learned will be the subject of a future article.

In addition to providing knowledge that could be shared in Konomerume and the Wajambo region, NILI/InField increased participation in the greater international discussion of Kari'nja by Kari'nja themselves. Chief Mandé and Sieglien Jubithana began their exposure to an international audience with Yamada et al. (2008). During NILI-InField, the nine-member team shared their work informally with other participants, and formally as presenters to series of plenary sessions entitled, "**Models of language documentation and revitalization: What models of language maintenance and revitalization work?**" Furthermore, Chief Mandé contributed to training budding fieldworkers in methods and ethics by co-presenting a workshop entitled, "Blurring the Lines: Language Community Partnerships and Respectful Linguistic Research." He provided the invaluable perspective of a speech community member who had had limited access to formal schooling but has nonetheless proven himself to be a capable linguist and documenter of his own language. In the workshop, he demonstrated what a balanced, successful partnership might look like, inspiring students with his dedication and knowledge.

Members of the Konomerume team have become strong advocates for themselves. During NILI/InField, Chief Mandé attended a course on language activism. He drafted a press release that he eventually submitted to a local newspaper in Paramaribo. In addition, he and other team members made the case for greater recognition of Aretyry Kari'nja to both the RKBO and the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname (VIDS). They argued that the Aretyry dialect of Kari'nja is a valid variety of the language on a par

with the more prestigious Tyrewuju dialect. They lobbied successfully for greater support of Kari'nja in the elementary school, which resulted in a daily Kari'nja component. In addition to increased lesson time devoted to the language, a Kari'nja math curriculum was piloted and eventually adopted. This curriculum was originally created by the VIDS for Tyrewuju. However, through the Konomerume Kari'nja team's advocacy, an Aretyry version was created. This would not have been possible without community member advocacy at both the local and greater administrative levels. That the Konomerume team was empowered to participate actively in decisions that affect them is a direct result of a newfound confidence that was developed and nurtured through the training they received at NILI/InField.

Chief Mandé has always had a direct impact on my own academic analysis of the language (c.f. Yamada, 2011b). However, there is now a larger cadre of analysts trained at NILI/InField available to dissect and describe linguistic phenomena. Our discussions have led to deeper understanding that serves both of our needs. Chief Mandé and other teachers find that their newfound ability to analyze linguistic constructions enhances their teaching. My own analyses better reflect speaker intuitions about their language because we are able to engage in more in-depth discussions of patterns. My analyses are true to the data, but with the added richness that speakers trained in linguistics can provide.

According to several Konomerume team members, attending NILI/InField served to whet their appetite for more knowledge. One teacher expressed a common sentiment that the time spent at Oregon was far too short. He and other teachers have approached me to request that I develop a workshop that further builds on the training they received at NILI/InField. I hope to be able to fulfill this request in cooperation with other trainers who would travel to Suriname to deliver a workshop for both Konomerume and other community members. All Konomerume team members have said that the experience has had a positive impact on their teaching, learning, and advocacy for the language. Each participant has found him or herself in the position of explaining some facet of Kari'nja grammar or justifying the need for increased attention to and resources for endangered languages in Suriname. These intangible benefits are not quantifiable, but are nonetheless important.

Other less tangible outcomes of this project include increased confidence and the inspiration afforded by learning with members of other communities. That Konomerume community members have advocated with government and school officials for increased recognition of Aretyry Kari'nja is a testament to their increased confidence in themselves. Furthermore, they advocate in an informed and principled way that elicits the respect of bureaucrats. During their time in Oregon, they interacted both formally and informally with a wide range of people. All participants, however, shared a devotion to the promotion, preservation, and revitalization of endangered indigenous languages. This camaraderie provided the benefit of inspiration. Knowing one is not alone mitigates the ongoing, often thankless, day-to-day struggle of language work. All participants expressed gratitude for the interactions with other language activists and the friendships they forged.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS. In a compelling argument for more engaged linguistic research with speakers of endangered indigenous languages, Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) notes the reciprocal nature of relationships between outsider academic linguists and

speech community members.¹⁶ “Thus, CBLR [(Community-Based Language Research)] is based on the recognition that community members have expertise and can be experts... linguists are neither the sole researchers nor the only experts... (2009:25).” In this context, training for speech community members further levels the playing field. Not only can well-trained speech community members engage in independent projects of their own design, they can participate in deeper, more comprehensive projects with outsider academics. Ultimately, more in-depth collaboration and multiple end users’ involvement in projects foster more maximally useful output.

Empowerment-focused research models (c.f. Cameron et al., 1992; 1997) ask whose research agenda is foregrounded in a linguistic documentation project. Although community collaboration has become a buzzword, it is nonetheless the case that the outsider linguist’s goals often come first. There is an expectation that community goals can wait. The academic has more pressing things, like earning a degree or tenure, to attend to before addressing community needs. However, by training community members to conduct their own documentation, description, and revitalization projects, no single entity’s agenda is foregrounded. Community-inclusive linguistic research is more effective with good training--both for community members in the practicalities of research, and for outsider academics in language and culture. Furthermore, with training, community members are empowered to have a voice in research that concerns them. They can determine both how to teach outsiders about their languages, and also have a say in how they are represented to the greater academic community.¹⁷

Czaykowska-Higgins (2009) further argues for a model that empowers community members to control the content of a documentation.¹⁸ What better way to foster this independence than to train community members to conduct documentation for themselves? Community-inclusive linguistic field research that includes a training component for community members enhances collaboration by building capacity for community members to conduct their own research. Those most affected by language loss--speech community members themselves--are empowered to become active knowledge builders. With more advanced training, speech community members are empowered to formulate an independent agenda and conduct their own research. In addition, their collaboration with outsider academics can be more balanced as community members articulate their own needs where their language is concerned. Comprehensively trained community members can also participate in projects beyond working on language documentation with a linguist. They can play a vital role in contributing to and managing community-based language archives (c.f.

¹⁶ Crippen and Robinson (2013) argue in favor of a non-collaborative, ‘Lone Wolf’ model of social science fieldwork that does not subordinate the linguist’s research goals to those of community members. Their point that community members must be willing and able to work in collaboration with an outsider researcher is well taken. If the outsider linguist is the sole decision-maker for a project, it is not a true collaboration.

¹⁷ Even data in a linguistic analysis may have an impact on how a community is perceived. For example, a verb like ‘murder,’ in languages that have such a verb, illustrates a maximally agentive agent and a maximally affected patient. A single token in a greater analysis is unproblematic on its own. However, we might examine how a community is being represented if all examples from the language are similarly violent.

¹⁸ She also offers a compelling argument for the non-neutral nature of linguistic research with endangered indigenous languages.

Linn, 2011). They can advocate for themselves with higher bureaucracies, as evidenced by the Konomerume team's advocacy with the RKBO and VIDS. Finally, with training and experience, members of communities whose indigenous heritage languages are under threat can participate in greater international discussions of their languages, cultures, and natural resources.

At the heart of any successful collaboration are the relationships among major stakeholders. By inviting participation from community members and building trust over the long term, the outsider academic ensures a more cooperative partnership. With training, community members learn to advocate for themselves. Furthermore, in a trusting, cooperative relationship, no single person is solely responsible for a project's success or failure. When inevitable problems arise, community members can be relied on to work together with the outsider academic to find a solution that meets all parties' needs.

REFERENCES

- Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, M. B. H. Rampton, & Kay Richardson. 1992. *Researching Language: Issues of power and method*. London: Routledge.
- Cameron, Deborah, Elizabeth Frazer, Penelope Harvey, M. B. H. Rampton, & Kay Richardson. 1997. Ethics, *Advocacy and Empowerment in Researching Language*. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski, eds., *Sociolinguistics: A reader and coursebook*. Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 145-162.
- Crippen, James A. & Laura C. Robinson. 2013. In Defense of the Lone Wolf: Collaboration in Language Documentation. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 7: 123-135. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4577>.
- Czaykowska-Higgins, Ewa. 2009. Research Models, Community Engagement, and Linguistic Fieldwork: Reflections on Working within Canadian Indigenous Communities. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3:15-50. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4577>.
- Dobrin, Lise. 2008. From linguistic elicitation to eliciting the linguist: Lessons in community empowerment from Melanesia. *Language* 84(2): 300-324. DOI: 10.1353/lan.0.0009.
- Fishman, Joshua A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Fitzgerald, Colleen M. & Mary S. Linn. 2013. Training Communities, Training Graduate Students: The 2012 Oklahoma Breath of Life Workshop. *Language Documentation and Conservation* 7: 185-206. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4596>.
- Florey, Margaret. 2004. Countering purism: confronting the emergence of new varieties in a training programme for community language workers. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language Documentation and Description* 2: 9-27.
- Furbee, N. Louanna & Lori A. Stanley. 2002. A collaborative model for preparing indigenous curators of a heritage language. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 154, 113-128.
- Grinevald, Colette. 2003. Speakers and documentation of endangered languages. In Peter K. Austin (ed.) *Language documentation and description*, vol. 1, 52-72. London: Hans Rausing Endangered Languages Project.

- Guérin, Valérie & Sébastien Lacrampe. Trust me, I am a linguist! Building partnership in the field. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4: 22-33. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4465>.
- Hoff, Berend. 1968. *The Carib Language*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Holton, Gary. 2009. Relatively ethical: A comparison of linguistic research paradigms in Alaska and Indonesia. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 3(2): 161-175. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4424>.
- Leonard, Wesley Y. & Erin Haynes. 2010. Making “collaboration” collaborative: An examination of perspectives that frame linguistic field research. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 4: 268-293. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/5077>.
- Linn, Mary S. 2011. Living Archives: A Community-Based Archive Model. In David Nathan (ed.) *Proceedings of Language Documentation and Linguistic Theory* 3: 59-70. London: School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Mihas, Elena I. 2012. Subcontracting Native Speakers in Linguistic Fieldwork: A Case Study of the Ashéninka Perené (Arawak) Research Community from the Peruvian Amazon. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 6: 1-21. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4502>.
- Morrill, Angela. 2008. Decolonizing Klamath Termination: Critiquing Factionalism in Klamath Termination Discourse. MA Thesis, University of California, San Diego.
- Nathan, David. 2006. Thick interfaces: mobilizing language documentation with multimedia. In J. Gippert, N. Himmelmann, & U. Mosel (eds.) *Essentials of Language Documentation*. 363-379. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rice, Keren. 2011. Documentary Linguistics and Community Relations. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 5: 187-207. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4498>.
- Stebbins, Tonya. 2003. *Fighting language endangerment: community directed research on Sm'algayax (Coast Tsimshian)*. Kyoto: Nakanishi Printing Co., Ltd.
- Suriname General Bureau of Statistics Census Office. 2004. *7th Population and Housing Census of Suriname*. Paramaribo.
- Vallejos, Rosa. 2014. Integrating Language Documentation, Language Preservation, and Linguistic Research: Working with the Kokamas from the Amazon. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 8: 38-65. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4618>.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. 2011a. Integrating Documentation and Formal Teaching of Kari'nja: Documentary materials as pedagogical materials. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 5: 1-30. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4486>.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. 2011b. An updated analysis of *ky-* and *-ng* in Kari'nja: Evidentiality or deixis? *International Journal of American Linguistics* 77(1): 59-89. DOI: 10.1086/657328.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. 2010. *Speech Community-Based Documentation, Description and Revitalization: Kari'nja in Konomerume*. PhD Diss., University of Oregon.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. 2007. Collaborative Linguistic Fieldwork: Practical application of the empowerment model. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 1(2): 257-282. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/1717>.
- Yamada, Racquel-María. In Press. Mobilities into (and out of) Konomerume. In Légise, Isabelle and Bettina Migge (eds.) *In and Out of Suriname - Language, Mobility and Identity*. Leiden: Brill.

- Yamada, Racquel-María, Ferdinand Mandé, & Sieglien Jubithana. 2008. Collaborative Linguistic Fieldwork: Kari'nja in Konomerume. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Caribbean Linguistics. Cayenne, French Guiana.
- Yamada, Racquel-María & Sieglien Jubithana. 2013. From Konomerume to Oregon: Training in the communitycollaborative context. Poster presented to the Annual Meeting of the Linguistics Society of America, Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation. Boston, MA.

Racquel-María Yamada
racquel@ou.edu